

Remarks

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated December 30, 2003 and the indication of allowable subject matter. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.


Claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Honda (USP 6,500,294). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda '294 in view of Krenkel et al. (US 6,042,935). Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacher (USP 6,102,184) in view of Sakano (JP 3-88347). These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

The Examiner indicated that claims 7-10 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the "optical system" introduced in allowable claim 1. Amended claim 1 now recites "a control step for controlling the application of adhesive on the adhesion zone using an optical system" and, while not identical to allowable claim 7, the substantive limitations of allowable claim 7 have been incorporated into independent claim 1.

In re MARCHISSEAU, et al.
09/988,398

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments resolve all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe additional discussion would advance the prosecution of the present application, they are invited to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Matthew Stavish
Reg. N° 36,286

Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda MD, 20817
Tel. (301) 896-0600
Fax. (703) 896-0607